

## A perturbation solution for the wedge-flow in power-law fluids

SREEDHAN ROY\*

Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Aston, Birmingham-4, England

(Received 1 August 1972)

### NOMENCLATURE

- $f$ , dimensionless stream function;
- $m$ , exponent in mainstream flow velocity,  $U_\infty \sim x^m$ ;
- $n$ , parameter in constitutive equation for power-law fluids;
- $x$ , distance along the surface;
- $\alpha$ , parameter dependent on  $n$  in equation (9);
- $\beta$ , wedge-parameter in equation (1);
- $c$ , perturbation parameter in equation (3);
- $\eta$ , similarity variable.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Considerable attention has lately been devoted to the study of forced convection boundary layer flows in non-Newtonian power-law fluids. Studies of the corresponding problem of Blasius-flow have been made by Acrivos *et al.* (1960), Defrawi & Finlayson (1972), Lemieux *et al.* (1971) and Roy (1972). Dorfman & Vishnevskii (1972) studied flows with arbitrary pressure-gradients. Shah (1961) studied the wedge-flow and obtained similarity solutions for different values of the wedge-parameter  $\beta$ . Acrivos *et al.* (1965) studied afresh Shah's problem and presented an approximate expression for skin-friction by an asymptotic method.

In this communication, we propose to solve the corresponding Falkner-Skan equation for wedge-flows by a perturbation technique. It will be seen that the results thus obtained are fairly reasonable compared with those presented by others.

### 2. ANALYSIS

The appropriate Falkner-Skan equation is

$$\frac{d}{d\eta} (f''^n + f f'' + \beta(1 - (f')^2)) = 0, \quad \dots \quad (1)$$

$$\beta = m(n+1)/(2mn - m + 1),$$

\* Present address : Department of Mathematics, University of Delhi, Delhi-7, India.

subject to the boundary conditions

$$f(0) = f'(0) = 0, \quad f'(\infty) = 1. \quad \dots (2)$$

Let us assume that the fluid is slightly non-Newtonian and that

$$\text{and} \quad \left. \begin{aligned} n &= 1 + \epsilon \text{ (}\epsilon \text{ being small),} \\ f &= f_0 + \epsilon f_1 + \epsilon^2 f_2. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad \dots (3)$$

Substituting from (3) into (1) and equating the co-efficients of different powers of  $\epsilon$  to zero we get the following equations for  $f_0$ ,  $f_1$  and  $f_2$ .

$$\left. \begin{aligned} f_0''' + f_0 f_0'' + \beta_0(1 - f_0'^2) &= 0, \\ f_1''' + f_0 f_1'' - 2\beta_0 f_0' f_1' + f_0'' f_1 + \beta_1(1 - f_0'^2) \\ &\quad + f_0'''(1 + \log f_0'') = 0, \\ f_2''' + f_0 f_2'' - 2\beta_0 f_0' f_2' + f_0'' f_2 + f_1'''(1 + \log f_0'') + f_1 f_1'' - \beta_0 f_1'^2 \\ &\quad - 2\beta_1 f_0' f_1' + \beta_2(1 - f_0'^2) + f_0''' \{f_1''/f_0'' + \log f_0'' + \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}(\log f_0'')^2\} = 0, \\ f_i(0) = f_i'(0) &= 0, \quad f_0'(\infty) = 1, \\ f_1'(\infty) = f_2'(\infty) &= 0, \end{aligned} \right\} \quad \dots (4)$$

where

$$\beta_0 = \frac{2m}{m+1}, \quad \beta_1 = \frac{1}{2}\beta_0(1 - 2\beta_0), \quad \beta_2 = -\beta_0\beta_1.$$

### 3. SOLUTIONS

Equations (4) have been numerically solved on an electronic computer. The results are presented in table 1. So,

$$f''(0) = f_0''(0) + \epsilon f_1''(0) + \epsilon^2 f_2''(0) \quad \dots (5)$$

Table 1. The values of  $f_0''(0)$ ,  $f_1''(0)$  and  $f_2''(0)$  for different  $\beta_0$

| $\beta_0$  | 0        | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1         |
|------------|----------|---------------|-----------|
| $f_0''(0)$ | 0.4096   | 0.927680      | 1.232588  |
| $f_1''(0)$ | 0.112497 | -0.169612     | -0.685606 |
| $f_2''(0)$ | 0.019918 | 0.266235      | 0.979367  |

#### 4. COMPARISON WITH EXISTING RESULTS

*Case 1 :  $\beta_0 = 0$*

This is the most extensively studied case. Shah (1961) gave an exact solution, Lemieux *et al* (1971) gave an exact solution together with one based on variational principle. Also they gave formulae similar to (5) for pseudoplastic fluids ( $n < 1$ ), namely,

$$\text{exact solution : } f''(0) = 0.4752 + 0.1696 \epsilon, \quad (6)$$

$$\text{variational principle : } f''(0) = 0.5057 + 0.1648 \epsilon \quad (7)$$

We found a quadratic fit, by the method of least squares, of the results given by Shah. It is

$$f''(0) = 0.4787 + 0.0975 \epsilon - 0.0041 \epsilon^2. \quad (8)$$

In table 2 we compare the results given by the equations (5)–(8) with those of Shah (1961).

Table 2. Values of  $f''(0)$  for  $\beta_0 = 0$

| $\epsilon$ | Shah (1961) | Eq. (6) | Eq. (7) | Eq. (8) | Roy    |
|------------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|--------|
| 0.5        | 0.4341      | 0.3904  | 0.4216  | 0.4289  | 0.4183 |
| 0.0        | 0.4696      | 0.4752  | 0.5057  | 0.4787  | 0.4696 |
| 0.5        | 0.5258      | 0.5600  | 0.5899  | 0.5264  | 0.5308 |
| 1.0        | 0.5766      | 0.6448  | 0.6741  | 0.5720  | 0.6020 |
| 1.5        | 0.6188      | 0.7206  | 0.7583  | 0.6156  | 0.6832 |
| 2.0        | 0.6540      | 0.8144  | 0.8425  | 0.6572  | 0.7743 |

*Case 2 :  $\beta_0 = \frac{1}{2}$  and 1*

Acrivos *et al* (1965) presented the following approximate relationship based on the asymptotic solutions of equations (1) and (2) as  $\beta \rightarrow 0$  and as  $\beta \rightarrow \infty$

$$f''(0) \simeq \left\{ \alpha^{n+1} + \frac{2}{3} \frac{m(n+1)^2}{n(1-m+2mn)} \right\}^{1/n} \quad (9)$$

where  $\alpha = \alpha(n)$  are the values of  $f''(0)$  for  $\beta = 0$  calculated by Shah (1961), namely the entries in the second column of table 2.

We compare our results with those of Shah (1961) and Acrivos *et al* (1965) for  $\beta_0 = \frac{1}{2}$  and 1 in table 3.

Table 3. Values of  $f''(0)$  for  $\beta_0 = \frac{1}{2}$  and 1

| $c$  | Acirivos <i>et al</i> (1965) |               | Shah (1961)   | Roy                     |               |
|------|------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------|
|      | $\beta_0 = \frac{1}{2}$      | $\beta_0 = 1$ | $\beta_0 = 1$ | $\beta_0 = \frac{1}{2}$ | $\beta_0 = 1$ |
| -0.5 | 1.1826                       | 2.209         | 2.187         | 1.0790                  | 1.8202        |
| 0.0  | 0.9419                       | 1.246         | 1.233         | 0.9277                  | 1.2326        |
| 0.5  | 0.8942                       | 1.081         | —             | 0.9094                  | 1.1346        |
| 1.0  | 0.8844                       | 0.981         | 0.973         | 1.0243                  | 1.5263        |

## REFERENCES

- Acirivos A. Shah M. J. & Petersen E. E. 1960 *A.I.Ch.E. Jour.* **6**, 312.  
 Acirivos A. Shah M. J. & Petersen E. E. 1965 *Chem. Engng. Sci.* **20**, 101.  
 Dorfman A. Sh. & Vishnevskii V. K. 1972 *Int. Chem. Engng.* **12**, 288.  
 Defrawi M. E. & Finlayson B. A. 1972 *A.I.Ch.E. Jour.* **18**, 251.  
 Lemieux P. F., Dubey R. N. & Unny T. E. 1971 *Jour. Appl. Mech.* **93**, 345.  
 Roy S. 1972 *A.I.Ch.E. Jour.* **18**, 666.  
 Shah M. J. 1961 *Ph.D. Thesis, University of California, Berkeley.*